

# **भारत का राजपत्र** **The Gazette of India**

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
 PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 44] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अक्टूबर 31, 1970/कार्तिक 9, 1892  
 No. 44] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1970/KARTIKA 9, 1892

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।  
 Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed  
 as a separate compilation.

## **भाग II—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii)** **PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)**

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर)  
 केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों द्वारा जारी किये गये विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

**Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).**

### **ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA**

#### **ORDERS**

*New Delhi, the 22nd September 1970*

**S.O. 3496.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shrimati Bhagwan Dei W/o Shri Ram Charan, R/o Mohalla Sarai Murtaza, Khurja, District Bulandshahr, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for mid-term general elections, 1969, to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 385-Anupshahr Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of her election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that she has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shrimati Bhagwan Dei, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/385/69(135).]

## भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

## आदेशों

नई दिल्ली, 22 सितम्बर, 1970

का०आ० 3496—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यविधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 385-अनुपशहर सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाली उम्मीदवार श्रीमती भगवान देई पत्नी रामचरण, निवासी सराय मूर्तजा, खुर्जा, जिला बुलन्दशहर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रही हैं ;

2-और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

3-अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्रीमती भगवान देई को मंसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[मं०-उ०प्र०-वि०म०/385/69 (135)]

S.O. 3497.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ganga, Sharan, S/o Shri Shrichand, R/o 1/604, Nehru Road, Baraut, District Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for mid-term general elections, 1969, to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 404-Baraut Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ganga Sharan, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/404/69(136).]

का०आ० 3497.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यविधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 404-बड़ौत सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गंगा शरण मुपुव श्री श्रीचन्द, 1/604, नेहरू रोड़, बड़ौत, जिला मेरठ, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री गंगा शरण को मंसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा

अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०-उ०प्र०-वि०स०/404/69(136)]

New Delhi, the 23rd September 1970

**S.O. 3498.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Harbir, S/o Shri Randhir, R/o Ansari Road, Muzaffarnagar, District Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for mid-term general elections 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 410-Muzaffarnagar Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Harbir, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/410/69(138).]

नई दिल्ली, 23 सितम्बर, 1970

का०शा० 3498.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए संरक्षित साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 410—मुजफ्फरनगर सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री हरवीर मुपुत्र श्री रणधीर, निवासी सम्रसारी रोड, मुजफ्फरनगर, जिला मुजफ्फरनगर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्विनायक नियमों द्वारा अधिष्ठित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं।

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास इन अनकृता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यान नहीं है;

3. अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री हरवीर को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[ सं०-उ०प्र०-वि० स०/410/69 (138)]

**S.O. 3499.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Tara Chand, S/o Shri Mukanda, R/o village Medhpur, Post Office Badhedi, District Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for mid-term general elections, 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 410-Muzaffarnagar Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Tara Chand to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/410/69(139).]

का०आ० 3499.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 410—मुजफ्फरनगर सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री ताराचन्द सुपुत्र श्री मुकन्द, निवासी मेंदपुर, पो० बडेढी, जिला मुजफ्फरनगर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्दीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री तारा चन्द को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ;

[सं०—उ० प्र०—वि० सं०/410/69 (139)]

S.O. 3500.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Man Singh, S/o Shri Khacheru, R/o village Khokni, Post Office Galibpur, District Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for mid-term general elections, 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh, Legislative Assembly from 410-Muzaffarnagar Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Man Singh, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/410/69(140).]

का०आ० 3500.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 410—मुजफ्फरनगर सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मान सिंह सुपुत्र श्री लखेड़ निवासी गांव खोकनी, पो० गालिबपुर, जिला मुजफ्फरनगर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्दीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री मान सिंह को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है ।

[सं०—उ० प्र०—वि० सं०/410/69 (140) ]

*New Delhi, the 26th September 1970*

**S.O. 3501.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Hoti Lal, S/o Shri Mewa Ram, R/o Mohalla Choki Gate, House No. 233, Firozabad, District Agra, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for Mid-term General election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 342-Karhal (SC) Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Hoti Lal, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/342/69(143).]

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 1970

**एस० ओ० 3501.**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 342-करहल (अनु० जा०) सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री होती लाल मुपुत्र श्री मेवा राम, निवासी मोहल्ला चौकीगेट, मकान नं० 233, फिरोजाबाद, जिला आगरा, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री होती लाल को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस प्रदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाहित घोषित करता है।

[मं०-उ०प्र०-वि०स०/342/69(143)]

**S.O. 3502.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Radhey, S/o Shri Surjai, R/o Village Pasupur, Post Office Mahabatpur, District Mainpuri, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for Mid-term general election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 342-Karhal (SC) Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Radhey, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/342/69(144).]

**एस० आ० 3502.**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 342-करहल (अनु० जा०) सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राधे सुपुत्र श्री मुरजई, गांव पमूपुर, डा० मुहबतपुर, जिला मैनपुरी, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे समयक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राधे को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०/प्र०/वि०/सं०/342/69(144)]

**S.O. 3503.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ram Singh S/o Shri Chet Ram, R/o Village Patsue Shyam Nagar, Post Office Amer Nagla Jiwan, District Mainpuri, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for Mid-term general election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 342-Karhal (SC) Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ram Singh, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/342/69(145).]

**एस० आ० 3503.**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 342-करहल (अनु० जा०) सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राम सिंह सुपुत्र श्री चेत राम, गांव पटसुई श्यामनगर, डा० अमेर तंगला जीवन, जिला मैनपुरी, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे समयक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राम सिंह को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निर्वाहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०-उ०/प्र०-वि० सं०/342/69(145)]

**S.O. 3504.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mithoo Lal, S/o Shri Karhori, R/o Village Marhapur, Post Office Karhal, District Mainpuri, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for Mid-term general election, 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 342-Karhal (SC) Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mithoo Lal, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/342/69(146).]

By Order,

A. N. SEN, Secy.

**एस० ओ० 3504.**—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि माधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 342-करहल (अनु० जा०) सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मिट्ठू लाल सुपुत्र श्री करहोरी, गांव मझपुर, डा० करहल, जिला मेनपुरी, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मिट्ठू लाल को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० उ०प्र०-वि० सं०/342/69(146)]

आदेश से,

ए० एन० सेन,

सचिव।

## MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 13th October 1970

**S.O. 3505.**—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act 1948, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri S. N. Awasthi, Assistant in the Trade Representation of India, East Berlin to perform the duties of a Consular Agent, with effect from 5th August, 1970, until further orders.

[No. F.T.4330/2/70.]

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 13 अक्टूबर, 1970

**एस० ओ० 3505**—राजनयिक एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 के खण्ड 2 धारा (क) के अनुपालन में केन्द्र सरकार इसके द्वारा भारत के व्यापार प्रतिनिधि

के कार्यालय पूर्वी बर्लिन में सहायक श्री एस० एन० अवस्थी को दिनांक 5-8-70 से अगला आदेश होने तक कौंसली अभिकर्ता का कार्य करने के अधिकार देती है।

[सं० टी० 4330/2/70]

**S.O. 3506.**—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act 1948, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri J. L. Uberoi, Assistant in the Consulate-General of India, Berlin, to perform the duties of a Consular Agent, with effect from the 12th June, 1970, until further orders.

[No. F.T.4330/2/70.]

**एस० ओ० 3506**—राजनयिक एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 के खण्ड 2 धारा (क) के अनुपालन में, केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा भारत के प्रधान कौंसलावास, बर्लिन में सहायक, श्री जे० एल० उबेराय को दिनांक 12 जून, 1970 से अगला आदेश होने तक, कौंसली अभिकर्ता का कार्य करने का अधिकार देती है।

[सं० टी० 4330/2/70]

**S.O. 3507.**—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act 1948, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri R. S. Bhardwaj, Assistant in the Embassy of India, Damascus to perform the duties of a Consular Agent, with immediate effect, until further orders.

[No. F.T.4330/2/70.]

**एस० ओ० 3507**—राजनयिक एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 खण्ड 2 धारा (क) के अनुपालन में केन्द्र सरकार इसके द्वारा भारत के दमिश्क स्थित राजदूतावास में सहायक, श्री आर० एस० भारद्वाज को तत्काल से, अगला आदेश होने तक, कौंसली प्रतिनिधि का कार्य करने का अधिकार देती है।

[संख्या टी० 4330/2/70]

**S.O. 3508.**—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act 1948, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri M. K. Chhibber, Assistant in the Embassy of India, Lima to perform the duties of a Consular Agent, with immediate effect until further orders.

[No. F.T.4330/2/70.]

P. C. BHATTACHARJEE, Under Secy.

**एस० ओ० 3508**—राजनयिक एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 के खण्ड 2 धारा (क) के अनुपालन में, केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा भारतीय राजदूतावास, लीमा में सहायक, श्री एम० के० छिब्वर को इसी समय से, अगला आदेश होने तक कौंसली अभिकर्ता का कार्य करने का अधिकार देती है।

[संख्या टी० 4330/2/70]

पी० सी० भट्टाचारजी,  
अवर सचिव, भारत सरकार।



MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 12th October 1970

S. O 3509.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 2nd October, 1970.

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES		Rs.	ASSETS		Rs.
Capital Paid Up	.	5,00,00,000	Notes	.	39,49,85,000
	.		Rupee Coin	.	8,74,000
Reserve Fund	.	150,00,00,000	Small Coin	.	5,38,000
	.		Bills Purchased and Discounted :—		
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	.	172,00,00,000	(a) Internal	.	..
	.		(b) External	.	..
	.		(c) Government Treasury Bills	.	123,89,03,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	.	37,00,00,000	Balances held Abroad*	.	114,58,91,000
	.		Investments**	.	94,01,49,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	.	95,00,00,000	Loans and Advances to :—		
	.		(i) Central Government	.	..
	.		(ii) State Governments@	.	140,21,19,000
Deposits :—			Loans and Advances to :—		
(a) Government			(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	.	169,86,57,000
(i) Central Government	.	196,70,22,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	.	256,50,88,000
	.		(iii) Others	.	3,58,00,000



An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 2nd day of October 1970.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	39,49,85,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :-		
Notes in Circulation	3851,50,26,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Total Notes issued		3891,00,11,000	(b) Held outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	351,42,00,000	
			TOTAL		533,95,11,000
			Rupee Coin		64,72,78,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		3292,32,22,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
TOTAL LIABILITIES		3891,00,11,000	TOTAL ASSETS		3891,00,11,000

Dated the 7th day of October, 1970.

S. JAGANNATHAN,  
Governor.  
[No. F. 3(3)-BC/70.]

वित्त मंत्रालय  
(बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 अक्टूबर, 1970

एस० ओ० 35 09.—2 अक्टूबर, 1970 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

विवरण	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूजा . . . . .	5,00,00,000	नोट . . . . .	39,49,85,000
आरक्षित निधि . . . . .	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का . . . . .	8,74,000
		छोटा सिक्का . . . . .	5,38,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण . . . . .	172,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल :—	
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि		(क) देशी . . . . .	..
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण . . . . .	37,00,00,000	(ख) विदेशी . . . . .	..
(स्थिरीकरण) निधि		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल . . . . .	123,89,03,000
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण . . . . .	95,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ वकाया* . . . . .	114,58,91,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि . . . . .		निवेश** . . . . .	94,01,49,000
जमा-राशियां :—		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(क) सरकारी			
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार . . . . .	196,70,22,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को . . . . .	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें . . . . .	4,77,79,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को @ . . . . .	140,21,19,000
		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(ख) बैंक		(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को† . . . . .	169,86,57,000
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक . . . . .	202,04,84,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को†† . . . . .	256,50,88,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	8,53,56,000	(iii) दूसरों को . . . . .	3,58,00,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से	
		ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	

		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	71,77,000	(i) राज्य सरकारों को . . . . .	34,43,00,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक . . . . .	33,58,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को . . . . .	21,84,12,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को . . . . .	..
(ग) अन्य . . . . .	121,14,77,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	9,57,02,000
देय बिल . . . . .	42,12,92,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	5,11,33,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	
अन्य देयताएं . . . . .	37,87,72,000	(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	26,26,71,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश ..	..
		अन्य आस्तियां . . . . .	33,74,95,000
रुपये . . . . .	1073,27,17,000	रुपये . . . . .	1073,27,17,000

\* नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

\*\* राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों के अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

† रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मीयादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 79,13,02,000/- रुपये शामिल हैं।

†† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख : 7 अक्तूबर, 1970।

## रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया

रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में अक्तूबर, 1970 की 2 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

इशू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :—		
नोट . . . . .	39,49,85,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000	
संचालन में नोट . . . . .	3851,50,26,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ . . . . .	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	351,42,00,000	
जारी किए गए कुल नोट . . . . .		3891,00,11,000	जोड़ . . . . .		533,95,11,000
			रुपये का सिक्का . . . . .		64,72,78,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां . . . . .		3292,32,22,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र . . . . .		..
कुल देयताएं . . . . .		3891,00,11,000	कुल आस्तियां . . . . .		3891,00,11,000

तारीख : 7 अक्तूबर, 1970।

एस० जगन्नाथन,  
गवर्नर।

[सं० एफ० 3 (3)—बी० सी०/70]

*New Delhi, the 14th October 1970*

**S.O. 3510.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 9 of the said Act shall not apply till the 5th October, 1971, to the Vijaya Bank Ltd., Mangalore, in respect of the immovable property (plot of land bearing T.S. No. 832) held by it at Mangalore (South Kanara).

[No. F.15(20)-BC/70.]

नई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर 1970

**क्र० नि० 3510.**—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम 1949 (1949 का दसवां) की धारा 53 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबन्ध विजय बैंक लिमिटेड, मंगलौर पर उसके अधिकार में मंगलौर (दक्षिण कनारा) स्थित अचल सम्पत्ति (भू-खण्ड टी० एस० संख्या 832) के सम्बन्ध में 5 अक्टूबर 1971 तक लागू नहीं होंगे।

[संख्या एक० 15(20)—बी० सी०/70]

New Delhi, the 16th October 1970

S.O. 3511.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 9th October, 1970.

## BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES		Rs.	ASSETS		Rs.
Capital Paid Up . . . . .		5,00,00,000	Notes . . . . .		9,00,34,000
			Rupee Coin . . . . .		2,81,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .		150,00,00,000	Small Coin . . . . .		5,36,000
			Bills Purchased and Discounted :—		
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund		172,00,00,000	(a) Internal . . . . .		..
			(b) External . . . . .		..
			(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .		59,06,83,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .		37,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad* . . . . .		106,70,72,000
			Investments** . . . . .		103,65,33,000
			Loans and Advances to :—		
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .		95,00,00,000	(i) Central Government . . . . .		..
			(ii) State Governments @ . . . . .		156,52,71,000
			Loans and Advances to :—		
			(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks† . . . . .		168,35,05,000
Deposits :—			(ii) State Co-operative Banks†† . . . . .		259,27,07,000
(a) Government—			(iii) Others . . . . .		3,10,05,000
(i) Central Government . . . . .		149,34,34,000			
(ii) State Governments . . . . .		4,57,76,000			



		[Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund —	
(b) Banks—		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks . . . . .	201,95,68,000	(i) State Governments . . . . .	34,42,28,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	8,73,38,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	21,82,23,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	70,97,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks . . . . .	..
(iv) Other Banks . . . . .	32,54,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures . . . . .	9,57,02,000
(c) Others . . . . .	111,09,42,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund —	
Bills Payable . . . . .	21,85,09,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	
Other Liabilities . . . . .	37,24,10,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund —	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank . . . . .	26,26,71,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank . . . . .	..
		Other Assets . . . . .	31,91,41,000
	Rupees . . . . .		Rupees . . . . .
	994,83,28,000		994,83,28,000

\*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

\*\*Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 87,32,00,000/- advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 14th day of October, 1970.

As Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 9th day of October 1970

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	9,00,34,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—		
			(a) Held in India . . . .	182,53,11,000	
Notes in circulation . . . .	3943,60,08,000		(b) Held outside India . . . .	..	
Total Notes issued . . . .		3952,60,42,000	Foreign Securities . . . .	361,42,00,000	
			TOTAL . . . .		543,95,11,000
			Rupee Coin . . . .		61,32,90,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		3347,32,41,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper . . . .		..
TOTAL LIABILITIES . . . .		3952,60,42,000	TOTAL ASSETS . . . .		3952,60,42,000

Dated the 14th day of October, 1970.

S. JAGANNATHAN,  
Governor.  
[No. F.3(3)-BC/70].  
K. YESURATNAM, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 16 अक्टूबर, 1970

एत० अ० 3511.—9 अक्टूबर 1970 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण।

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी . . . . .	5,00,00,000	नोट . . . . .	9,00,34,000
भारक्षित निधि . . . . .	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का . . . . .	2,81,000
		छोटा सिक्का . . . . .	5,36,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि . . . . .	172,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल :—	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि . . . . .	37,00,00,000	(क) देशी . . . . .	..
		(ख) विदेशी . . . . .	..
		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल . . . . .	59,06,83,000
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि . . . . .	95,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया* . . . . .	106,70,72,000
		निवेश** . . . . .	103,65,33,000
जमा-राशियां :—			
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार . . . . .	149,34,34,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को . . . . .	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें . . . . .	4,57,76,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को @ . . . . .	156,52,71,000
		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(ख) बैंक		(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को† . . . . .	168,35,05,000
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक . . . . .	201,95,68,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को†† . . . . .	259,27,07,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	8,73,38,000	(iii) दूसरों को . . . . .	3,10,05,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	

देयताएं	रुपये	भास्तियां	रुपये
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम:—	
(iii) गर-अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक . . . . .	70,97,000	(i) राज्य सरकारों को . . . . .	34,42,28,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक . . . . .	32,54,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को . . . . .	21,82,23,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को . . . . .	..
(ग) अन्य . . . . .	111,09,42,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण	
		और अग्रिम . . . . .	9,57,02,000
देय बिल . . . . .	21,85,09,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	5,07,36,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से	
		ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	
अन्य देयताएं . . . . .	37,24,10,000	(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम . . . . .	26,26,71,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश . . . . .	..
		अन्य भास्तियां . . . . .	31,91,41,000
रुपये . . . . .	994,83,28,000	रुपये . . . . .	994,83,28,000

\* नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

\*\* राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों के अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

† रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मियादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 87,32,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

†† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख: 14 अक्टूबर, 1970।

रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में अक्टूबर 1970 की 9 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिये लेखा  
इञ्चू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपय	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :-		
नोट . . . . .	9,00,34,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000	
संचलन में नोट	3943,60,08,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा		
			हुआ . . . . .	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	361,42,00,000	
जारी किए गए कुल नोट		3952,60,42,000			
			जोड़ . . . . .		543,95,11,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		61,32,90,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया . . . . .		
			प्रतिभूतियां		3347,32,41,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और		
			दूसरे वाणिज्य पत्र . . . . .		..
कुल देयताएं . . . . .		[3952,60,42,000	कुल आस्तियां . . . . .		3952,60,42,000

तारीख : 14 अक्टूबर, 1970।

एस० जगन्नाथन,  
गवर्नर।

[सं० फ० 3(3)-बी० सी०/70]

के० यशुरत्नम, अनू-सचिव।

## CORRIGENDA

I. In the Gazette of India issue dated 18th April 1970 Part II Section 3(ii)—

- (i) At page 1888 the figure of Rs. 130,70,73,000 appearing against sub-head 'Loans and Advances to State Governments' on the Assets side of the Statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on 6th March 1970 should be read as Rs. 130,70,72,000.
- (ii) At page 1889 the figure of Rs. 117,45,15,000 appearing against head 'Other Liabilities' on the Liabilities side of the statement should be read as Rs. 117,45,78,000.

II. In the Gazette of India issue dated 16th May 1970 Part II Section 3(ii)—

At page 2281 the figure of Rs. 1,61,85,000 appearing against sub-head 'Deposits—Non-scheduled State Co-operative Banks' on the Liabilities side of the Statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on 24th April 1970 should be read as Rs. 1,61,95,000.

As the discrepancies relate only to the Hindi version of the statements, a Hindi version of the Corrigendum is enclosed.

## शुद्धि-पत्र

I. तारीख 18 अप्रैल 1970 के भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II खंड 3(ii) के—

(i) पृष्ठ 1888 पर 6 मार्च 1970 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप के विवरण में आस्तियों के पक्ष में उप शीर्ष "राज्य सरकारों को ऋण और अधिम" के सामने छपे हुए अंक 130, 70, 73,000 रुपयों के स्थान पर 130, 70, 72,000 रुपये पढ़ा जाए।

(ii) पृष्ठ 1889 पर विवरण के देयताओं के पक्ष में उप शीर्ष "दूसरी देयताएँ" के सामने छपे हुए अंक 117, 45, 15,000 रुपयों के स्थान पर 117, 45, 78,000 रुपये पढ़ा जाए।

II. तारीख 16 मई 1970 के भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II खंड 3(ii) के—

पृष्ठ 2281 पर प्रकाशित 24 अप्रैल 1970 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप के विवरण में देयताओं के पक्ष में उप शीर्ष "जमा राशियाँ और अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक के सामने छपे हुए अंक 1, 61, 85,000 रुपयों के स्थान पर 61, 85,000 रुपये पढ़ा जाए।

In the statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India Banking Department as on the 21st August 1970 published at pages 4020-21 of Part II Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India issue dated 12th September 1970 the figure against the head "Deposits—(c) Others", appearing on the liabilities side of the statement should be read as 100,61,38,000 instead of 160,61,33,000.

## (Department of Revenue and Insurance)

## INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 13th October 1970

S.O. 3512.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, the "prescribed authority" for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961).

## Institution

National Centre for the Performing Arts, Bombay.

[No. 166/No. F.203/9/70-IT(A-II).]

S. BHATTACHARYYA, Dy. Secy.

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

आय-कर

नई दिल्ली, 13 अक्टूबर, 1970

का० नि० 3512.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि निम्नवर्णित संस्था वैज्ञानिक तथा औद्योगिक अनुसंधान परिषद द्वारा आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 35 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए "विहित प्राधिकरण" अनुमोदित कर दिया गया है।

संस्था

नेशनल सेंटर फार दी परफॉर्मिंग आर्ट्स म्यूजि

[स० 166/का० सं० 203/9/70-आई० टी० (ए०-ii)]

एस० भट्टाचार्य, उप सचिव।

(Department of Revenue and Insurance)

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 13th October 1970

S.O. 3513.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) No. S.O. 2248, dated the 29th June, 1970, published at pages 1029—1032 of the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3 Sub-section (ii), dated the 29th June, 1970, at page 1030—

- (i) in lines 16—18, for the entry under the heading "Percentage", read "As applicable under treaty of leader of Indian Aviation Insurers";
- (ii) in line 35, against "(a) Marine premiums", insert "25 per cent".

[No. F.51(10)Ins.I/70.]

M. L. WADHAWAN, Dy. Secy.

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 7th September 1970

S.O. 3514.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in partial modification of its earlier order No. 82 (F. No. 261/18/70-ITJ) dated the 19th May, 1970 the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that in the schedule annexed thereto in serial 5 under Dhanbad Range, Special Circle, Dhanbad shall be added as item (vi) in column 3 thereof.

This notification shall take effect from 7th September, 1970.

Explanatory Note

The modification has become necessary on account of the recent creation of new circle, namely special circle Dhanbad.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 157 (F. No. 261/18/70-ITJ.)]

## केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

आय-कर

नई दिल्ली, 7 सितम्बर, 1970.

**एस० ओ० 3514.**—आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का और उसे इस निमित्त समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा अपने पूर्वतर आदेश सँ० 82(फा० सँ० 261/18/70-आई टी जे) तारीख 19 मई, 1970 के आंशिक उपांतरण में केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्द्वारा निदेश देता है कि उससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में धनवाद रेंज के अधीन क्रम 5 में, उस के स्तम्भ 3 में मद (1) के रूप में विशेष सकिल, धनवाद जोड़ा जाएगा।

यह अधिसूचना 7 सितम्बर, 1970 से प्रभावी होगी।

स्पष्टीकरण टिप्पण—

हालही में एक नए सकिल अर्थात् विशेष सकिल, धनवाद के बन जाने के कारण यह उपांतरण आवश्यक हो गया है।

(उक्त टिप्पण अधिसूचना का भाग नहीं है किन्तु वह केवल स्पष्टीकरण देने के लिए आशयित है)  
[सँ० 157(फा० सँ० 261/18/70-आई टी जे)]

### CORRIGENDUM

*New Delhi, the 9th September 1970*

**S.O. 3515.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf, the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby directs that the following correction shall be made in its Notification No. 140 (F. No. 261/17/70-ITJ) dated 1st August, 1970:

In the last line of the Notification after the words 'from' for '1st August, 1970' read '1st September, 1970.'

[No. 158 (F. No. 261/17/70-ITJ)]

Y. SINGH, Under Secy.

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 9 सितम्बर, 1970

**एस० ओ० 355.**—आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों और उसे इस निमित्त समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्द्वारा निदेश देता है कि उसकी अधिसूचना सँ० 140 (फा० सँ० 261/17/70-आई टी जे) तारीख 1 अगस्त, 1970 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किया जाएगा :—

अधिसूचना की अंतिम पक्ति में "अधिसूचना" शब्द के पश्चात् "1 अगस्त, 1970" के स्थान पर "1 सितम्बर, 1970" पढ़िए।

[सँ० 158 (फा० सँ० 261/17/70-आई टी जे)]

वाई० सिंह,  
अवर सचिव।



**MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION**

(Department of Cooperation)

New Delhi, the 14th October 1970

S.O. 3516.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 8(1) of the National Cooperative Development Corporation Act 1962 (No. 26 of 1962), the Central Government, in consultation with the National Cooperative Development Corporation, have appointed Shri M. M. K. Wali, an Officer of the Rajasthan Cadre and of the Indian Administrative Service, as Secretary of the Corporation with effect from the forenoon of the 18th August, 1970.

[No. F.6-2/67-Plan/Misc.]

A. DAS, Jt. Secy.

**खाद्य, कृषि, सामुदायिक विकास और सहकारिता मंत्रालय**  
(सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर, 1970

का० आ० 3516.—राष्ट्रीय सहकारिता विकास निगम अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 26) की धारा 8 (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, राष्ट्रीय सहकारिता विकास निगम के परामर्श से, श्री एम० एम० के० वाली, राजस्थान काडर और भारतीय प्रशासनिक सेवा के एक अधिकारी, को 18 अगस्त, 1970 के पूर्वाह्न से निगम के सचिव के रूप में नियुक्त किया है।

[सं० फा० 6-2/67-प्लान/मिसले०]

ए० दास, संयुक्त सचिव।

**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE**

New Delhi, the 12th October 1970

S.O. 3517.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of clause 21C of the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948, the Central Government hereby specifies:—

- (i) 6 paise per square metre as the rate for the purposes of paragraph (b) of sub-clause (1) of clause 21C aforesaid; and
- (ii) 6 paise per square metre for grey dhoti and saree and 4 paise per square metre for other varieties as the rates for the purposes of paragraph (a) of sub-clause (1) of clause 21C aforesaid; for the quarter ending with 31st October, 1970.

[No. F.7/5/70-Tex-A.]

H. K. BANSAL, Dy. Secy.

**विदेशी व्यापार मंत्रालय**

नई दिल्ली, 12 अक्टूबर, 1970.

फा०आ० 3517.—सूती वस्त्र (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1958 के खण्ड 21-ग के उप खण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार 31 अक्टूबर, 1970 को समाप्त होने वाली तिमाही के लिए ;

- (1) उपरोक्त खण्ड 21-ग के उपखण्ड (1) की कंडिका (ख) के प्रयोजन के लिए 6 पैसे प्रति वर्ग मीटर की दर ; तथा

- (2) उपरोक्त खण्ड 21-ग के उपखण्ड (1) की कंडिका (क) के प्रयोजन के लिए कोरी धोती तथा साड़ी हेतु 6 पैसे प्रति वर्ग मीटर और अन्य किस्मों हेतु 4 पैसे प्रति वर्ग मीटर की दर, एतद्द्वारा विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० फा० 7/5/70-टैक्स-क]

एच० के० वंसल, उप सचिव।

*New Delhi, the 14th October 1970*

**S. O 3518.**—Increase of the powers conferred by clause (g) of sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948. The Central Government hereby nominate Dr. G. Rangaswami, Dean, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore to be a member of the Central Silk Board and make the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Foreign Trade No S.O 1522 dated the 23rd April, 1970, namely :—

In the said notification, after serial number 28, the following shall be inserted namely :—

“29. Dr. G. Rangaswami, Dean, University of Agricultural Sciences, Hebbal, Bangalore-24.

Sericulture expert nominated by the Central Government under section 4(3)(i) of the Act.”

[No. F. 21/1/70-Tex (F)]

DAULAT RAM, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर 1970

**का० आ० 3518.**—केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 4 की उप-धारा (3) के खण्ड (अ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा डा० जी० रंगास्वामी संकायाध्यक्ष, कृषि विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, बंगलौर को केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड का एक सदस्य मनोनीत करती है तथा भारत सरकार के विदेशी व्यापार मंत्रालय के का० आ० 1522 दिनांक 23-4-1970 में और भी आगे निम्नोक्त संशोधन करती है अर्थात् :—

उपयुक्त अधिसूचना में क्रमांक 28 के पश्चात् निम्नोक्त प्रविष्टि की जायेगी, अर्थात् :—

“29. डा० जी० रंगास्वामी,

अधिनियम की धारा 4(3)(अ) के अन्तर्गत

संकायाध्यक्ष,

केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मनोनीत रेशम उत्पादन

कृषि विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, हैबल,

विशेषज्ञ”

बंगलौर-24।

[सं० फा० 21/1/70-टैक्स (एफ०)]

दौलत राम, अवर सचिव।

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(C.L.A.)

Cancellation Order

*New Delhi, the 27th June 1970*

**S.O. 3519.**—M/s. Vimal Jewellers, House No. 1366, Pitaliyon Ka Chowk, Johari Bazar, Jaipur were granted import licence No. P/L/2603817/C dated 2nd March 1970. They have applied for duplicate copy (custom purposes copy only) of licence on the ground that the original custom purposes copy have been lost. It is further stated that the original licence was not registered and not utilized.

In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original Custom Purposes copy of licence No. P/L/2603817/C dated 2nd March 1970 has been lost and direct that the duplicate licence (custom copy) should be issued to the applicant. The original custom purposes copy of licence is cancelled.

[No. Gem.66/OD.69/SC.IV/C.L.A.]

D. S. MORKRIMA,

Dy. Chief Controller Imports & Exports.

(संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

(केन्द्रीय लाइसेंस क्षेत्र)

लाइसेंस नष्ट करने का आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 1970

एस० ओ० 3519.—सर्वश्री विमान ज्वेलर्स मंगलन सख्या 1366 पितलियों का चौक, जौहरी बाजार जयपुर को आयात लाइसेंस सख्या पी/एल/2603817/सी दिनांक 2-3-70 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने लाइसेंस अनुलिपि (केवल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य संबंधी प्रति) के लिए आवेदन किया है इसके लिए उन्होंने यह आधार प्रस्तुत किया है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य संबंधी प्रति खो गई है। आगे यह बताया गया है कि मूल लाइसेंस न पंजीकृत किया गया है और न उसका उपयोग ही किया गया है।

अपने तर्क में समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथपत्र जमा किया है। मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस सं० पी०/एल/2603817, दिनांक 2-3-70 की मूल सीमा शुल्क कार्य संबंधी प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि अनुलिपि लाइसेंस (सीमा-शुल्क प्रति) आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य संबंधी प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या जेम 66/ओ डी 69/एम सी 4/सी एल ए]

डी० एस० मोरक्रिमा,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात।

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th October 1970

S.O. 3520.—M/s. Continental Device India Ltd., Faridabad, Haryana, were granted import licence No. P/D/2170595 dated 18th July, 1969 from G.C.A. for import of spare parts valued at Rs. 23,600. They have requested for the issue of duplicate Custom Purpose Copy of the licence on the ground that the original Custom Copy of the licence has been lost by them, it has been further reported by the licensee that the licence had an unutilised balance of Rs. 13440. The licence was registered with New Delhi Custom Office.

2. In support of their contention the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Custom Purpose Copy of the licence No. P/D/2170595 dated 18th July, 1969 has been lost and directs that a duplicate Custom Purposes copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The original Custom Purposes Copy is cancelled.

The duplicate Custom Copy is being issued separately.

[No. F.Radio/1/1/69-70/R.M.II.]

G. D. BAHL,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports  
for Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

## (मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 अक्टूबर, 1970

**का० प्र० 3520.**—सर्वश्री कान्टीनेन्टल डिवाइस इंडिया लि०, फरीदाबाद को सामान्य मुद्रा क्षेत्र से फालतू पुर्जों के आयात के लिए 23,600/- रु० का आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी० डी० 2170595 दिनांक 18-7-69 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने उपयुक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमा शुल्क प्रति जारी करने के लिए अनुरोध किया है इसके लिए उन्होंने यह आधार दिया है कि उन के द्वारा लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रति खो गई है। लाइसेंस धारी द्वारा आगे बताया गया है कि लाइसेंस में शेष राशि 13,440/- का उपयोग नहीं किया गया था। लाइसेंस नई दिल्ली के सीमा शुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत किया गया था।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र जमा किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी इससे संतुष्ट है कि लाइसेंस संख्या पी० डी० 2170595 दिनांक 18-7-69 की मूल सीमा शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति खो गई है और निदेश करता है कि उन्हें उपयुक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमा शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल सीमा शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

अनुलिपि सीमा शुल्क प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या रेडियो 1/1/69-70/आर० एम० 2.]

जी० डी० बहल,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात

हुते मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यात।

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th October 1970

**S.O. 3521.**—M/s. The Tata Hydro Electric Power Supply Co. Ltd. The Andhr Valley Power Supply Co. Ltd., The Tata Power Co. Ltd., Bombay were granted an import licence No. P/HP/2077211/CXX/25/C/H/25/CG.IV dated 11th July 1967. They have applied for the issue of a duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence on the grounds that the original Customs purposes copy has been misplaced. It is further stated that the original Customs Purposes copy was registered with the Customs authorities at Bombay and was utilised for Rs. 63,606 and the balance available on it was Rs. 10,088.

2. In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit duly sworn in before Notary Public, Maharashtra State, Bombay. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs Purposes copy of the said licence has been lost. Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7th December 1955 as amended, the said original Customs Purposes copy of licence No. P/HP/2077211 dated 11th July 1967 issued to M/s. Tata Hydro Electric Power Supply Co. Ltd., Bombay is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued separately.

[No. HEP/T-14/67-68/CG.IV.]

H. D. GUPTA,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports &amp; Exports

(महान नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यातका कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली 15 अक्टूबर, 1970

एस० ओ० 3521—सर्वश्री दि टाटा हाइड्रो इलेक्ट्रिक पावर सप्लाई क० लि०, दि आन्ध्र वैली पावर सप्लाई क० लि० दि टाटा पावर क० लि०, बम्बई को आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी०/एच पी/2077211/सी/एक्स एक्स/25/सी/एच/25/सी० जी०-4, दिनांक 11-7-1967 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति की अनुलिपि के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य-सम्बन्धी प्रति गलत स्थान पर रख दी गई है। आगे उल्लेख किया गया है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य-सम्बन्धी प्रति सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकारी, बम्बई से पंजीकृत कराई गई थी तथा उसका उपयोग 63,606-रुपये तक हो गया था और इस पर प्राप्य शेष रुपया 10,088/- था।

2. इस तर्क की पुष्टि में आवेदक ने नोटरी पब्लिक, महाराष्ट्र राज्य, बम्बई के समक्ष विधिवत् शपथ ले कर एक गणपत्र जमा किया है। तदनुसार मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति खो गई है। अतः यथा संशोधित, आयात (नियंत्रण) आवेदन, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की उप-धारा 9 (सी सी) के अन्तर्गत, सर्वश्री टाटा हाइड्रो इलेक्ट्रिक पावर सप्लाई क० लि०, बम्बई को जारी किए गए लाइसेंस सं० पी०/एच पी/2077211, दिनांक 11-7-1967 की मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति को एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

3. उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति की अनुलिपि अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या एच ई पी/टी-14/67-68/सी० जी०-4]

एच० डी० गुप्ता,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यात।

**DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

New Delhi, the 22nd August 1970

O. 3522.—In exercise of the powers conferred on it by Sub-Section 1 of Section 52 of the Delhi Development Act (No. 61 of 1957), the Delhi Development Authority hereby empowers the Chairman, Delhi Development Authority to constitute the Housing Committee under Section 5 A *ibid* and to determine the organisational set-up and take all other action necessary for implementing the Housing and allied Schemes.

[No. F.1(20)70-HD/DHC.]

दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

नई दिल्ली 22 अगस्त, 1970

एस०ओ० 3522.—दिल्ली डेवेलपमेंट एक्ट (1957 के संख्या 61) के सेक्शन 52 के सब सेक्शन-1 द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का उपयोग करते हुए दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण, आवास समिति बनाने एवं उससे संबंधित संस्थापना निर्धारित करने एवं तत्सम्बन्धी अन्य योजनाओं को कार्यान्वित करने के लिये 5-ए इबिड के अंतर्गत, अध्यक्ष महोदय को अधिकार प्रदान करता है।

[सं० एफ० 1 (20)70-एच० डी०/डी एच सी]

**S.O. 3523.**—In exercise of the powers conferred on it by Sub-Section 1 of Section 52 of the Delhi Development Act (No. 61 of 1957), the Delhi Development Authority hereby directs that all the powers exercisable by it under the said Act except the powers to make Regulations shall also be exercised by the Housing Committee of the Authority constituted under Section 5 A *ibid*.

[No. F. 2(20)/70-HD/DHC.]

M. L. MONGIA, Secy.

**एस० ओ० 3523.**—दिल्ली डेवेलपमेंट एक्ट (1957 की संख्या 61) के सेक्शन 52 के सब सेक्शन I द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का उपयोग करते हुए दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण सेक्शन-5 ए इविड के अन्तर्गत आवास समिति को नियमावली बनाने के अनिवार्य उसी एक्ट के अन्तर्गत उपयोग किए जाने वाले सभी अधिकारों को प्रदान करता है।

[स० एफ० 2(20)/70-एच० डी०/डी एच सी]

मदन लाल मोंगिया, सचिव।

### मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय

#### कार्मिक विभाग

#### शुद्धि पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर, 1970

**का० आ० 3524**—भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 19 सितम्बर, 1970 के भाग II खंड 3 उपखंड (ii) के पृष्ठ 4060 पर मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय (कार्मिक विभाग) के का० आ० 3009 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के आदेश दिनांक 3 सितम्बर, 1970 में ऊपर से दूसरी पंक्ति में “धारा 8” के स्थान पर “धारा 5” तथा “एतद्वारा” के स्थान पर “एतद्वारा” और नीचे से दूसरी पंक्ति में “प्रसंग” के स्थान पर “संसंग” पढ़ा जाये।

[स० 288/11/67-ए० बी० डी०-II]

**का० आ० 3525**—भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 19 सितम्बर, 1970 के भाग II खंड 3 उपखंड (ii) के पृष्ठ 4059 पर मंत्रिमंडल सचिवालय (कार्मिक विभाग) के का० आ० 3008 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना दिनांक 3 सितम्बर, 1970 में ऊपर से तीसरी पंक्ति में “स्थापन” के स्थान पर “स्थापना” और नीचे से दूसरी पंक्ति में ‘प्रसंग’ के स्थान पर ‘संसंग’ पढ़ा जाये।

[स० 288/11/67-ए० बी० डी०-II]

**का० आ० 3526**—भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 19 सितम्बर, 1970 के भाग II खंड 3 उपखंड (ii) के पृष्ठ 4064 पर गृह मंत्रालय के का० आ० 3015 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना दिनांक 28 अगस्त, 1970 में ऊपर से तीसरी पंक्ति में ‘न्यायालय’ के स्थान पर ‘न्यायालयों’ और ऊपर से चौथी पंक्ति में ‘आर० सी० 24/ई०/68-कलकत्ता’ के स्थान पर ‘आर० सी० 11/ई०/68 कलकत्ता’ पढ़ा जाये।

[स० 255/43/70-ए० बी० डी० (2)]

बी० सी० बंजानी, अधिसचिव।

**MINISTRY OF STEEL & HEAVY ENGINEERING,  
(Iron & Steel Control)**

**ORDER**

*New Delhi, the 16th October 1970*

**S. O. 3527.**—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by Notification No. S.O. 1436, dated 18-4-67, under the Essential Commodities (Regulation of Production & Distribution for purposes of export) Order, 1966, I hereby direct that the firm specified in Column 1 of the Table below shall sell the goods as specified in Column 2 there-against to the firm specified in the corresponding entry in Column 3 of the said table for purposes of manufacture of Engineering goods for export at the price indicated there-against in column 4 subject to the conditions enumerated in Column 5 of the said table during the period Oct-December, 1970.

Name of the firm.	Specification of goods.	Name of the Exporter	Price condition	
1	2	3	4	5
M/s. Hindustan Koku Wire Ltd., F-40, New Delhi South Extension, Part 1, New Delhi-3.	High Carbon Wires 350.00 M/T. (Three hundred & fifty tons) only.	M/s. Jaipur Metals & Electricals Ltd., Near Railway Station, Jaipur-6, Rajasthan.	At current Market rate.	Supplies should be made on Export Priority basis (i.e. a priority next only to Defence).

[No. ESS. COMM/RPDE/74.]  
[No. PEP/1/J-1/70.]

*By Order etc.*

**S. S. SIDHU,**  
Director of Export Production,  
and Iron & Steel Controller.

**(इस्पात और भारी इंजीनियरी मंत्रालय  
(लोह तथा इस्पात नियंत्रण)**

**आदेश**

**कलकत्ता, 16 अक्तुबर, 1970**

**का० अा० 3527.**—आवश्यक वस्तु (नियत के प्रयोजनों के लिए उत्पादन और वितरण का विनियमन) आदेश 1966 के अन्तर्गत अधिसूचना सं० एस०ओ० 1436, दिनांक 18-4-67 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं एतद् द्वारा नीचे दिए गये तालिका के स्तम्भ 1 के फर्म को स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लेखित वस्तुओं को स्तम्भ 3 में नामांकित फर्म को इंजीनियरी वस्तुओं के उत्पादन

तथा नियति हेतु स्तम्भ 4 में दिए गये मूल्य पर स्तम्भ 5 में दिए हुए शर्तों पर अक्टूबर-दिसम्बर 1970 के अर्थाथ में विक्रय करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

फर्म का नाम	वस्तुओं का विस्तृत विवरण	निर्यातक का नाम	मूल्य	शर्त
1	2	3	4	5
मेसर्स हिन्दुस्तान, हाई कार्बन कोकोकु वायर लिमिटेड, एफ-40, नई दिल्ली साउथ एकस्टेंशन पार्ट-1, नई दिल्ली।	वायर्स 350.00 टन (तीन सौ पचास टन) सिर्फ।	मेसर्स जयपुर मेटल्स एंड इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लिमिटेड, रेलवे स्टेशन के नजदीक जयपुर-6, राजस्थान।	सामान्य मूल्य जो माल के भुगतान के समय हो।	माल का भुगतान प्राथमिकता के आधार पर (अर्थात् ऐसी प्राथमिकता जो प्रतिरक्षा के माल के भुगतान के बाद हो) देनी होगी।

[सं० ई एस एस सी० ओ एम एम/आर पी डी ई/74.]

(सं० पी ई पी/1/जे/1/70)

आज्ञा से इत्यादि,

एस० एस० सिद्धू,

निर्यात उत्पादन निदेशक,

और

लोह तथा इस्पात निदेशक

# MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 17th October 1970

S.O. 3528.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the matter of an application under Section 33A of the said Act, from Shri Chenchiah, Ambulance Driver in the Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY

COMPLAINT NO. CGIT-32 OF 1968

IN REF. NO. CGIT-6 OF 1965

PARTIES:

Chenchiah, Ambulance Driver.

Complainant.

Versus

Government of India, The Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings, Oorgaum P. O. K.G.F.

PRESENT:

Shri A. T. Zambre, Presiding Officer.

Opp. Party



APPEARANCES.

For the complainant—Shri M. C. Samuel, Advocate.

For the Opp. Party—Shri T. Rangaswamyengar, Legal Adviser.

STATE: Mysore.

INDUSTRY: Gold Mining.

Bombay, the 19th September, 1970

AWARD

The complainant Shri Chenchiah has filed this complaint against the Government of India, the proprietors of the Kolar Gold Mines Undertakings under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant was working as an ambulance driver in the Central Estate Department, South Section of the Kolar Gold Mining Undertaking and was dismissed from service on 15th July, 1968 during the pendency of industrial dispute Ref. No. CGIT-6 of 1965. The complainant has alleged that his dismissal by the management was *malafide*. No show cause notice was issued to him to attend the enquiry. No charge was framed against him and the enquiry was held behind his back and he was not given any opportunity to meet the case. He was not also offered one month's salary as contemplated by section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act and as the management has contravened the provisions of section 33 of the Act the dispute should be adjudicated and he should be reinstated.

3. The opponent the Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings, have by their written statement denied the allegations and have contended that the complainant was charged for the misconduct of absentsing himself without leave for more than ten consecutive days. But the communication sent to the complainant through the office attender was refused by him. Subsequently when the letters were sent to him by registered post the complainant evaded to receive the same which amounted to refusal and hence good service. As he evaded to take delivery of the various notices sent to him he cannot now take the plea of being ignorant of the communications. The enquiry against the opponent was conducted according to procedure and the principles of natural justice. He was given an opportunity to defend himself but he did not avail of the same. The complainant was also offered one month's salary as provided for in section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act and as the dismissal order was passed during the pendency of Ref. No. CGIT-6 of 1965 an application for approval of the action taken against the opponent was simultaneously made and was pending before this Tribunal as application No. CGIT-28/68. There was thus no question of contravention of the provisions of section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act and the complaint is not maintainable and the complainant is not entitled to any relief.

4. This complaint was heard along with the employers' application for approval CGIT-28/68. The parties have not led any oral evidence and the documents produced in the application are to be treated as evidence in this complaint. It is clear from the enquiry papers that the complainant was dismissed from service by order dated 15th July, 1968 when the industrial dispute Ref. No. CGIT-6 of 1965 was pending. It is clear from the dismissal order itself that the complainant was offered one month's wages as required by section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The application for the approval of the action has been also made simultaneously on the same day and it is clear that the management has complied with the provisions of section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The management has also produced the notices sent to the complainant by registered post and it was returned to them as the address did not accept the same. Rule 18 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules provides the manner of service of summons or notice. This rule says:—

“Subject to the provisions contained in rule 20, any notice, summons, process or order issued by a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or an Arbitrator, empowered to issue such notice, summons, process or order, may be served either personally or by registered post.”

The management has sent the notices to the opponent by registered post and has followed the proper procedure. The endorsements on the envelopes show that the complainant had evaded delivery and refused to take the notice and the service would be deemed to be proper and it shall have to be presumed that he knew the contents of the notices and the enquiry was neither illegal nor was there any violation of the principles of natural justice. As the management

has complied with the provisions of section 32 (2)(b) the management's application for approval of the complainant's dismissal has to be granted and the complaint shall have to be dismissed. Hence my award. The complaint is dismissed and it is adjudicated that the complainant is not entitled to any relief.

No order as to costs.

Let this award be submitted to the Government of India under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

(Sd.) A. T. ZAMBRE,  
Presiding Officer.

[No. 10/56/70-L.R. IV.]

**S.O. 3529.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act, from Shri Y. Amuz s/o Aruldoss, T. No. E527, Furnacemen, Oorgaum, Kolar Gold Field, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY

COMPLAINT NO. CGIT-48 OF 1968

IN REF. No. CGIT-6 OF 1965

PARTIES:

Y. Amuz s/o Aruldoss, T. No. 7527, Furnacemen, Oorgaum, K.G.F.—  
*Complainant.*

*Versus*

1. The Union of India represented by the Superintendent, Govt. of India, Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings.
2. The Chairman & Managing Director, K.G.M.U.—*Opp. Party.*

PRESENT:

Shri A. T. Zambre, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES.

*For the complainant*—Shri M. C. Samuel, Advocate.

*For the Opp. Party*—Shri T. Rangaswamy Iyengar, Legal Adviser.

STATE: Mysore.

INDUSTRY: Gold Mining.

Bombay, the 15th September, 1970

AWARD

Shri Y. Amuz son of Aruldoss a workman working in the K.G.M.U. has filed this complaint against the management for his illegal dismissal and for contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. He has alleged that the management had not held any proper enquiry and had grossly violated the principles of natural justice. There was no charge-sheet and no proper notice. The enquiry officer was biased and the punishment by the disciplinary authority was arbitrary and not based upon any sound reasoning and the management has contravened the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The Government of India, Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings by their written statement have challenged the allegations and have contended that the complainant was dismissed from service after due enquiry on 5th August, 1963 with effect from 24th July, 1963 and there was no contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act in the case. It has been further contended that the complainant filed a suit in the Court of the Civil Munsiff K.G.F. seeking a declaration that the order of dismissal was void and inoperative and the Court had decreed the suit in his favour. The management had first filed an appeal in the Court of the Civil Judge Kolar but it was dismissed and they were considering the question of filing a second appeal against the decision, but as there was no violation of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act the present complaint is not maintainable and the complainant is not entitled to any relief.

3. When the complaint came up for hearing the complainant gave a purchis that the management had reinstated him to his previous job and he did not want to press the complaint. However, it is clear from the date of dismissal order and the date of the order of the pending reference in respect of the bonus dispute that at the time when the complainant was dismissed from service no proceedings were pending before any authority constituted under the Industrial Disputes Act and there was no question of observing the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Clearly there was no question of compliance with the provisions and the management has rightly contended that the complainant is not maintainable. However as the complainant has been reinstated and as he does not press the complaint it is dismissed for want of prosecution. Hence my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

Let this award be submitted to the Government of India under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

(Sd.) A. T. ZAMBRE,

Presiding Officer.

[No. 10/57/70/L.R. IV.]

**S.O. 3530.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the matter of an application under Section 33A of the said Act, from Nundydroog Mine Labour Association, Station Road, Oorgaum Post Office, Kolar Gold Field on behalf of their workman which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1970.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY**

**COMPLAINT No. CGIT-40 OF 1968**

**IN ARISING OUT OF REF. No. CGIT-6 OF 1965**

**PARTIES:**

The President, The Nundydroog Mine Labour Association, Station Road, Oorgaum K.G.F. 2—*Complainant.*

*Versus*

The Govt. of India, The Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings, Oorgaum P. O. K.G.F.—*Opp. Party.*

**PRESENT:**

Shri A. T. Zambre, Presiding Officer.

**APPEARANCES:**

*For the complainant*—No appearance.

*For the Opp. Party*—Shri T. Rangaswamy Iyengar, Legal Adviser.

**STATE:** Mysore.

**INDUSTRY:** Gold Mining.

*Bombay, dated 14th September, 1970*

### AWARD

The Nundydroog Mine Labour Association, a registered trade union has on behalf of its member workman filed this complaint against the Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings for the illegal termination of service and contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The union has alleged that the workman Shri Narayanaswamy was an employee of the mine and was working as a foreman. He was engaged for work in the mine on 15th May, 1934 at the age of 20 and he completed the age of 55 on 15th September, 1969 under the scheme of gratuity as per the award of the Industrial Tribunal applicable to the workman. But before that date the Government of India had illegally terminated his services from 1st July, 1968 and had committed a breach of the provisions of section 33 and the complaint should be adjudicated and he should be restored to his position as underground foreman immediately with back wages and an award be passed.

3. The opposite party the Government of India, Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings, have by their written statement denied the allegations. They have admitted that the workman Shri Narayanaswamy was engaged on 15th May,

1934 but have alleged that according to his service card his date of birth was 1912 and he was retired on 1st July, 1967 on superannuation on reaching his age of 55. It has been contended that he was granted two extensions of six months each and was due to retire on 1st July, 1968 and was accordingly retired on that date. They have further alleged that the management had given an opportunity to all the workers to make representations about the correctness of their birth dates but the applicant had not taken the opportunity or corrected the date of birth and he was superannuated from service with effect from 1st July, 1968 having had the benefit of two extensions. The complaint has been further resisted on the contention that the services of Shri Narayanaswamy were not terminated on account of any misconduct or on account of any disciplinary action and there was no question of contravention of the provisions of section 33 and he is not entitled to get any relief.

4 Notices of the hearing of the complaint were sent to the parties by registered post acknowledgement due. Accordingly the association was served with the notice of the hearing on 7th September, 1970 at Bangalore but it has remained absent and hence the proceedings are heard *ex parte*.

5 It is clear from the union's complaint itself that the workman Shri Narayanaswamy was not either discharged or dismissed from service by way of punishment. He was retired from service because of the completion of the age of 55 years and there is nothing to show that the management has contravened the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It also appears from the written statement of the Government of India, Kolar Gold Mining Undertakings that they had given an opportunity to their employees to make representations for the correction of their dates of birth and the representations were to be made between 2nd December 1963 and 31st March, 1964. They have stated that all the unions functioning in the field were informed and wide publicity was given to this matter by affixing the notice on the notice boards. At the request of the unions time was further extended by one month upto 30th April, 1964. Neither the workmen nor the union had made any representation and as per the record the workman completed 55 years of age on 1st July, 1967. He was given two extensions and I do not find that the management has done any injustice.

6 It is true that at the time when the workman was made to retire an industrial dispute regarding bonus, CGIT Ref No 6 of 1965 was pending before this Tribunal. However, it is clear that the workman has neither been discharged nor dismissed by way of punishment. There is no question of any contravention of Section 33 of the act and the workman is therefore not entitled to any relief. Hence my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

Let the award be submitted to Government under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

(Sd) A. T. ZAMBRE,  
Presiding Officer,  
Central Govt Industrial Tribunal, Bombay.

[No. 10/58/70-LR IV]

**S.O. 3531.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No 2) Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Mitra and Das Company Monopoly Contractors, Ghatkuri Iron Ore Mines of Messrs Rungta Mines (Private) Limited and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO 2)  
DHANBAD

PRESENT

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao Presiding Officer

REFERENCE No 5 OF 1970

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Mitra and Das Company  
Monopoly Contractors Ghatkuri Iron Ore Mines of Messrs Rungta  
Mines (Private) Limited

Their workmen.

AND

APPEARANCES:

*On behalf of the employers*—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.  
*On behalf of the workmen*—None.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Iron Ore.

Dhanbad, 3rd October, 1970

AWARD

The Central Government, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Mitra and Das Company Monopoly Contractors, Ghatkuri Iron Ore Mines of Messrs Rungta Mines (Private) Limited and their workmen, by its order No. 8/6/70-LRIV dated 9th April, 1970 referred to this Tribunal under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute in respect of the matters specified in the schedule annexed thereto. The schedule is extracted below:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of Messrs Mitra and Das Company Monopoly Contractors in terminating the service of Shri Pit Bahadur, Miner at Ghatkuri Iron Mines of Messrs Rungta Mines (Private) Limited was legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled and from which date?"

2. Employers filed their statement of demands. In spite of notice the workmen chose not to file their statement of demands.

3. In spite of service of notice and in spite of adjourning the hearings of the case on 22nd June, 1970, 20th July, 1970, 10th August, 1970 and 3rd September, 1970 no one appeared on behalf of the workmen. Consequently, the case proceeded in accordance with Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. In the statement of demands filed by the employers it was pleaded that the affected workman, Pit Bahadur was appointed on 29th May, 1969 as a probationer/casual miner, that upto 29th November, 1969 he worked on such dates as when work was available and that as there was no necessity of continuing him and also because there was no vacancy in the job of a miner the affected workman could not be given any work on and after 29th November, 1969. MW. 1, the Administrative Officer of the employers has also deposed that the affected workman was a probationer and he worked intermittently from 29th May, 1969 to 29th November, 1969, for a period of less than six months and that he was removed from service as there was no more work for him. MW. 1 has proved the Form B register for the year 1969, attendance registers in Form D for the period from 4th July, 1969 to 28th August, 1969 and 29th August, 1969 to 4th December, 1969 and a copy of certified standing orders, Exts. M1 to M3 respectively. Exts. M1 and M2 support the case of the employers pleaded in their statement of demands and deposed to by MW. 1 that the affected workman worked only for a few days in each month. Standing order 3(ii)(b) defines a 'probationer' workman as:

"one who is provisionally employed to fill a vacancy in a permanent post and has not completed six months service in that post. If a permanent workman is employed as a probationer in a new post, he may, at any time, during the probationary period not exceeding six months, be reverted to his old permanent post."

4. From the material discussed by me above it emerges that the affected workman was appointed a casual workman and he worked intermittently from 29th May, 1969 to 29th November, 1969, a period of less than six months. As such, the employers were justified in not giving him further work or removing him from service as a probationer workman. Consequently, he is not entitled to any relief.

5. I, therefore, find that the action of Messrs Mitra and Das Company Monopoly Contractors in terminating the service of Shri Pit Bahadur, miner at Ghatkuri Iron Ore Mines of Messrs Rungta Mines (Private) Limited was legal and justified and, consequently, the workman is not entitled to any relief. The award is made accordingly and submitted under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,  
 Presiding Officer,  
 Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal,  
 (No. 2 Dhanbad).  
 [No. 8/6/70-LR-IV.]

New Delhi, the 19th October 1970

**S.O. 3532.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of Shri K. Sharan, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Asansol, Arbitrator, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Samla Govindpur Colliery of Messrs Samla Govindpur Collieries Private Limited, Post Office Pandaveshwar, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th October, 1970.

**BEFORE SHRI K. SHARAN, REGIONAL LABOUR COMMISSIONER(C) AND ARBITRATOR, ASANSOL.**

**PRESENT:**

Shri K. Sharan, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Asansol.

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to Samla Govindpur Colliery of M/s. Samla Govindpur Collieries (P) Ltd., P.O. Pandaveshwar, Distt. Burdwan.

*Versus*

Their workmen

**APPEARANCES**

*For employer*—Shri K. P. Mukherjee, Counsel.

*For workmen*—Shri Kalyan Roy, M.P., Vice-President, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC), Asansol.

**INDUSTRY:** Coal Mine.  
No. E. 1/1(9)/69.

**STATE:** West Bengal

*Asansol, the 30th September, 1970*

#### AWARD

The Central Government having received on the 16th December, 1969, the arbitration agreement dated 9th December, 1969, between the management of Samla Govindpur Colliery of M/s. Samla Govindpur Collieries (P) Ltd., P.O. Pandaveshwar, Distt., Burdwan (hereinafter referred to as the management) and their workmen represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC), G.T. Road, Asansol (hereinafter referred to as the union) in pursuance of sub-section (1) of Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947) referring the industrial dispute between them, the specific matters in dispute being as detailed below to my arbitration, and the Central Government being of the opinion that the Industrial dispute referred to above existed between the management and the union, ordered publication of the said arbitration agreement in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) under its order No. 8/113/69-LR. II dated the 7th January, 1970.

*Specific matters in dispute:*

“Whether the action of the management of Samla Govindpur Colliery of M/s. Samla Govindpur Collieries (P) Ltd., P.O. Pandaveshwar, Distt., Burdwan (West Bengal) in paying retrenchment compensation to the entitled workmen of the Colliery in accordance with the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 25FFF of the I.D. Act, 1947 consequent upon the closure of Samla Govindpur Colliery with effect from 18th October, 1969, was justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

2. The General Secretary of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC), Asansol was requested under my letter No. E.1/1(9)/69 dated 27th December, 1969, to submit written statement on behalf of the workmen endorsing a copy thereof to the management and simultaneously the Managing Director, M/s. Samla Govindpur Collieries (P) Ltd., was requested to submit written statement on behalf of the management and also rejoinder, if any, on the written statement of the workmen under my letter No. E. 1/1(9)/69 dated 27th December, 1969. The management submitted written statement under its Managing Director's letter No. Nil dated 21st January, 1970, endorsing a copy thereof to the union. The union submitted its written statement under its Organising Secretary's letter No. Nil dated 27th January, 1970, endorsing a copy thereof to the management. The management, however, submitted rejoinder to the written statement of the union referred to above under its Managing Director's letter No. Nil dated 5th March, 1970,

endorsing a copy thereof to the union. Thereafter the matter came up for hearing on 14th April, 1970. On 14th April, 1970, Shri M. H. Jagani, Managing Director was present on behalf of the management and Shri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary of the union was present on behalf of the workmen. On that date the representative of the workmen requested for adjournment on the ground that Shri Kalyan Roy, Vice-President of the union who was conversant with the case was not available. In the circumstances, with the consent of the management further hearing was adjourned to be held in my office on 29th April, 1970. Both the parties also filed a statement dated 14th April, 1970, agreeing therein that I might give my arbitration award in the instant industrial dispute latest by 31st May, 1970. On 29th April, 1970, Shri M. H. Jagani, Managing Director was present on behalf of the management and Shri B. N. Tewari, General Secretary was present on behalf of the workmen. The representative of the union requested for adjournment on the ground that Shri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary of the union who was conversant with the case was out of station. The representative of the management was, however, reluctant for the adjournment but subsequently agreed for the adjournment and accordingly with the consent of the representative of the management the hearing was adjourned to be held in my office on 14th May, 1970. The parties also filed a written agreement dated 29th April, 1970, agreeing therein that I might give my arbitration award in the instant industrial dispute latest by 31st July, 1970. On 14th May, 1970, none was present on behalf of the management. However, Shri I. P. Singh, Labour Officer filed a petition dated 14th May, 1970, of the Managing Director for adjournment of the hearing to a date in the month of July, 1970, on the ground that he was sick and had been advised by the Doctor not to get up from bed. Shri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary of the union who was present had no objection for the adjournment and accordingly the hearing was adjourned to be held in my office on 3rd July, 1970. On 3rd July, 1970, none was present on behalf of the management. Shri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary of the union was present on behalf of the workmen. The Director of the management filed a petition dated 3rd July, 1970, still adjournment of the hearing on the ground that he was still confined to bed on account of his sickness and also submitted a medical certificate in support of his illness. The union representative had no objection to the request for adjournment and accordingly with his consent the hearing was adjourned to be held in my office on 22nd July, 1970. On 22nd July, 1970, Shri K. K. Pujari authorised representative of the management was present on behalf of the management and Shri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary of the union was present on behalf of the workmen. The representative of the management filed a petition dated 22nd July, 1970, of the Managing Director requesting therein for adjournment of the hearing on the ground that he continued to be ill. The union representative had no objection and as a special case the hearing was finally adjourned to be held in my office on 19th September, 1970. Both the parties filed an agreement on 22nd July, 1970, agreeing therein that I might give my arbitration award in the instant industrial dispute latest by 31st October, 1970. On 19th September, 1970, Shri K. P. Mukherjee, Counsel was present on behalf of the management and Shri Kalyan Roy, Vice-President, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha was present on behalf of the workmen. On that date nine documents were produced on behalf of the management which with the consent of the representative of the workmen were marked Ext. M.1. to M.9. The representative of the union did not produce any documentary evidence. On behalf of the management only one witness viz., Shri M. H. Jagani, Director (MW. 1) was produced. He was examined and cross-examined. On behalf of the workmen only one witness viz., Shri K. Mukherjee, Overman (WM. 1) was produced. He was examined and cross-examined. Thereafter I heard the arguments of both the parties.

3 The case of the management, in brief, as made out in their written statement is that the Samla Govindpur Colliery was completely closed down with effect from 18th October, 1969 "on account of the complete exhaustion of coal for normal workings of the Colliery and there being no further prospect to extract coal on any economic basis as well as for the reasons given by the appropriate authorities including the Mines Department". In their letter dated 26th June, 1969 addressed to the Director General of Mines Safety, the management had applied for developing a few galleries in respect of the said colliery in order to avoid immediate complete closure but the Chief Inspector of Mines expressed his inability to grant any permission to extract pillars for the purposes of further mining operations in the said colliery under his letter dated the 10th September, 1969. In the circumstances, it was beyond the control of the management to have further mining operations in MW. 1) was produced. He was examined and cross-examined. On behalf of the Colliery with effect from 18th October, 1969 under their notice dated 17th September, 1969. In the said notice they had also notified that in view of such

complete closure, the services of all the workmen concerned would stand terminated with effect from 18th October, 1969 and the eligible workmen would be paid compensation in terms of Section 25FFF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. As according to the management the closure of the Colliery was real, *bonafide* as well as complete no proceedings under the I.D. Act could be entertained or referred to the appropriate Government or any other authority. Notwithstanding this, in view of various decisions of the Supreme Court as well as Calcutta High Court relating to the interpretation of Section 25FFF of the I.D. Act, 1947 and the definition, "unavoidable circumstances beyond the control", the workmen concerned were entitled to compensation in accordance with the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 25FFF of the Act. As the closure of the colliery was due to unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the management the workmen concerned were not entitled to any relief whatsoever.

4. The case of the union, in brief, as made out in their written statement is that the management issued a notice dated 17th September, 1969 to close down the colliery with effect from 18th October, 1969 and the management offered compensation as per section 25FFF of the I.D. Act to the eligible workmen. Immediately thereafter the workmen "strongly protested but inspite of provocations remained quiet". Before the formation of the union in 1969 the workmen were unorganised. The registers of the management were prepared in such a way as to deny the workmen their legal dues. The management have, "pocketed the money of the workers which they should have deposited with the Provident Fund Office". Large number of workmen were not paid any compensation. As the workmen who had spent their lives in the colliery and had grown old and aged had been paid only three months salary as compensation. The offer of the management to pay compensation as per section 25FFF was wholly illegal, unjustified and *malafide* and amounted to unfair labour practice. The union demanded that all the workmen should be paid compensation as per Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and also full wages till the same was paid to them treating as if there was no retrenchment.

5. In their rejoinder to the written statement of the union, the management reiterated what had been stated by them in their written statement dated 21st January, 1970 and excepting those which had been specifically admitted in their written statement did not admit any of the allegations of the union mentioned in their written statement dated 27th January, 1970.

6. As regards preliminary objection of the management that in view of the fact that the closure of the colliery was real, *bonafide* and complete, no proceedings under the I.D. Act could be entertained, Shri K. P. Mukherjee, learned Counsel of the management withdrew this objection in view of the fact that in the instant case both parties jointly signed arbitration agreement referring the subject matter in dispute referred to above for my arbitration and the dispute was only in respect of quantum of retrenchment compensation paid to the entitled workmen consequent upon closure of Samla Govindpur Colliery with effect from 18th October, 1969. As the objection was withdrawn by the learned counsel, I do not consider it worthwhile to discuss it further.

7. During the course of hearing, the learned counsel on behalf of the management submitted that the colliery had been working for pretty long time and finally it had reached a stage that the coal reserve was practically exhausted, but in order to extract as much coal as possible before the colliery was to be finally closed, the management applied to the Director General Mines Safety, Dhanbad in June, 1969 for permission to drive some galleries but as this permission was refused by the latter under his letter dated the 10th September, 1969, there was no alternative left for the management but to close down the colliery. The closure was, therefore, beyond the control of the management as envisaged in proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the I.D. Act. He also urged that the ideal state that at the time of the closure of a coal mine not an ounce of coal should be left was un conceivable. At the last stage some coal was bound to be left, the extraction of which would be either not practicable and feasible and/or not economic. So was the case in respect of Samla Govindpur Colliery which was evident from the admission of the management's witness, Shri M. H. Jagani, Director, M/s. Samla Govindpur Collieries (P) Ltd. (MW. 1). The witness admitted that about seven to eight thousand of coal was left. Thus in view of this, it was mentioned in the notice of closure dated 17th September, 1969 (*vide* Ext. M.7) that no further prospect to extract coal on any economic basis was possible. He argued further that the Colliery was not closed on the ground of financial difficulties. He stressed that the colliery was



closed because the Directorate of Mines Safety had refused permission to drive further galleries to extract the extractable coal left behind and it was beyond the control of the management to continue to the mining operations in the Colliery. He submitted that even for argument sake if it was admitted that the Colliery was closed on account of financial difficulties as well, which according to him was not definitely the case, the closure of Samla Govindpur Colliery would not come within the mischief of explanation to proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the I.D. Act because it was admittedly not closed merely on account of financial difficulties. In this connection he placed reliance on the decision of the Supreme Court in *Hathi Singh Manufacturing Company vs. Union of India* (1960. II. LLJ. I) and the decision of the High Court at Calcutta in *Bhattacharjee Rubber Works vs. B.R.W.W. Union* (1960-Vol. II. LLJ-198).

8 Shri Kalyan Roy, M.P., learned representative of the workmen argued that in the instant case the closure of Samla Govindpur Colliery was on account of exhaustion of coal. This closure was not on account of any act of God, or calamities, like earthquakes, floods, fire etc., or for any enemy action or civil commotion or even on account of lawlessness. He argued that a mine was different from factory inasmuch as in case of a factory the closure could not be anticipated, whereas in case of a mine, particularly a coal mine, the date on which the coal would be exhausted was known to the employer on the very day on which the working of the mine was started. In other words, the Colliery owner knew how long the colliery was going to exist. Thus according to him the closure of a coal mine on account of exhaustion of coal could not be considered to be closure due to unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the management. In view of the same, he contended that the workmen of Samla Govindpur Colliery were entitled to compensation under Section 25F of the I.D. Act and not under proviso to sub-section (1) of section 25FFF of the Act. He placed reliance on the Supreme Court decision in *Hathi Singh Manufacturing Company, vs. Union of India* (1960-II-LLJ. I). He added that if the closure of a coal mine on account of exhaustion of coal would be treated as closure due to unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the management, the colliery workers would not be deprived of the benefits and safeguard which were intended to be provided for and safeguarded by the legislature while inserting Section 25FFF to the I.D. Act. While there may be justification in what he intends but there is absolutely no force in the argument in view of the existing section 25FFF of the I.D. Act. In this connection, explanation to proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the I.D. Act which is very relevant is reproduced below:—

“Explanation.—In undertaking which is closed down by reasons merely of financial difficulties (including financial losses) or accumulation of undisposed of stocks [or the expiry of the period of the lease or the licence granted to it where the period of the lease or the licence expires on or after the first day of April, 1967] (a), shall not be deemed to have been closed down on account of unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the employer within the meaning of the proviso to this sub-section”.

The “Explanation” which is precise and free from any ambiguity lays down that undertakings which are closed down from reason merely on financial reasons (including financial losses) or accumulation of undisposed of stocks or expiry of lease or licence granted to it where the period of lease or licence expired on or after the first day of April, 1967, should not be regarded to have been closed down on account of unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the employer. If the intention of the legislature would have been to include the closure of a mine on account of ‘exhaustion’ of the mineral extracted therefrom within the category of the closure of the type envisaged in the “Explanation”, it would have been indicated as such in the “Explanation” to proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the I.D. Act, 1947 but unfortunately it is not the case. Considering the ordinary meaning of the phrase, “unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the employer”. in my opinion, the closure of a coal mine on account of exhaustion of coal is a clear cut case of closure on account of unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the employer. When there is no coal available for extraction, where is the scope for the employer to continue to run the establishment? Closure of an establishment on account of financial difficulties or accumulation of undisposed of stocks or the expiry of the period of lease or licence granted to it were likely to be construed to be brought within the mischief of the proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and as such with a view to avoiding any confusion in this regard the “Explanation” had been inserted, but in my opinion, there

is absolutely no scope for any ambiguity in interpretation in case of closure of a coal mine on account of exhaustion of coal and hence closure of a mine on account of the exhaustion of the mineral extracted therefrom was not included in the "Explanation" to proviso to sub-Section (1) of section 25FFF of the I.D. Act.

9. In case where the closure of an establishment is due to the circumstances which could not be avoided by the employer and the circumstances which justify the closure are of such a nature as cannot be controlled by the employer, it shall in my opinion, come within the purview of proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the I.D. Act. In the instant case, it has been admitted by the learned representative of the union, that the closure is on account of exhaustion of coal. The management have adduced documentary as well as oral evidences to show that only Samla Seam of Samla Govindpur Colliery was proved and other seam was not proved in the area *vide* Ext. M. 3. This has not been challenged by the workmen. The management applied to the Directorate of Mines Safety, Dhanbad for permission to drive a few galleries to extract whatever coal could be obtained before finally closing down the colliery *vide* Ext. M. 4. This permission was not granted by the Directorate of Mines Safety *vide* Ext. M. 5. It is in these circumstances that the management closed down the Colliery with effect from 18th October, 1969 *vide* their notice dated 17th September, 1969 (*vide* Ext. M. 7). The Coal Board approved the closure of Samla Seam at Samla Govindpur Colliery with effect from 18th October, 1969 under its Dy. Secretary's letter dated 28th May, 1970 (*vide* Ext. M. 1). Shri K. Mukherjee, Overman, Samla Govindpur Colliery (WE-1) has however stated that "if the mining operations were carried on strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Mines Act and the Rules made thereunder, the Colliery would have continued to produce coal for about one year more". In view of the refusal of the Directorate of Mines Safety (*vide* Ext. M.5) to give permission sought for by the management for driving a few galleries, I am not inclined to accept the contention of Shri Mukherjee (WE. I) that the mine could have worked for one year or more. Moreover, the pleading before me by the learned representative of the workmen was contrary to the contention of the witness (WE. I). As already stated earlier, it has been admitted by the representative of the workmen that the closure was on account of exhaustion of coal. The allegations of the union against the management as contained in paras 2 and 3 of their written statement are not relevant to the issue before me because at no stage the workmen contended that the closure itself was either unreal or mala fide. Alleged improper maintenance of resisters, non-payment of provident fund dues etc. have nothing to do with the issue of applicability or otherwise of the proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in the matter of payment of retrenchment compensation to the workmen concerned in the dispute, which is the only subject matter of the reference before me.

10. In the circumstances, I hold that the management of Samla Govindpur Colliery of M/s. Samla Govindpur Collieries (P) Ltd., P.O. Pandaveshwar. Dist. Burdwan (West Bengal) was justified in paying retrenchment compensation to the entitled workmen of the Colliery in accordance with the proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 25FFF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and as such the workmen are not entitled to any relief. It is submitted to the Central Government under Section 10A(4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) K. SHARAN,  
Regional Labour Commissioner(C),  
Asansol and Arbitrator.  
30-9-1970.

[No. 8/113/69-LRII]

New Delhi, the 20th October 1970

**S.O. 3533.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under Section 33A of the said Act, from Shri Azad Ali, Binder, National Coal Development Corporation Press, Darbhanga House, Ranchi. Shri Apurba Krishna Mukherjee, Chairman, Planning Section, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Ranchi and National Coal Organisation Employees Association, Ranchi. Which was received by the Central Government on the 30th September, 1970

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)  
AT DHANBAD

PRESENT

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

COMPLAINT NO. 3 OF 1970

In the matter of a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.  
(Arising out of Reference No. 244 of 1967 referred to by the Ministry by its order  
No. 1/22/67-LRII dated 19th July, 1967).

PARTIES:

1. Azad Ali Binder, NCDC Press, NCDC Ltd., Darbhanga House, Ranchi.
2. Apurba Krishna Mukherjee, Chairman, Planning Section, NCDC Ltd., Darbhanga House, Ranchi.
3. National Coal Organisation Employees Association, Darbhanga House, Ranchi.—*Complainants*.

Vs.

1. The employers in relation to the National Coal Development Corporation Ltd., having its registered office at Darbhanga House, Ranchi through the Chairman.
2. Shri R. Sinha, Director (Admn.) NCDC Ltd., Ranchi.
3. The Chief of Administration, NCDC Ltd., Ranchi.—*Opp. Parties*.

APPEARANCES.

*On behalf of the Complainants*.—Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate.

*On behalf of the Opp. Parties*.—(1) Shri L. Singh, Labour Officer.

(2) Shri R. S. Murti, Additional Chief Personnel Officer.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

Dhanbad, 26th September, 1970

AWARD

The complainants are represented by Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate and the opposite parties by Shri L. Singh, Labour Officer and Shri R. S. Murti, Additional Chief Personnel Officer. On behalf of the complainants an application is submitted for permission to withdraw the complaint petition. Shri Karuna Nidhana Kashava, Advocate has verified the contents as correct. The reason shown in the application for withdrawal is not taken into consideration. Permission is granted. Accordingly no dispute award is made and submitted under Sec. 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer,  
[No. 1/22/67-LR.II(i).]

S.O. 3534.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under Section 33A of the said Act, from National Coal Organisation Employees Association, Darbhanga House, Ranchi for and on behalf of Shri J. M. Sinha, Assistant Superintendent which was received by the Central Government on the 30th September, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)  
AT DHANBAD

PRESENT

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

COMPLAINT No. 37 of 1970

In the matter of a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Arising out of Reference No. 244 of 1967 referred to by the Ministry by its order No. 1/22/67-LRII dated 19th July, 1967).

PARTIES:

National Coal Organisation Employees Association, Darbhanga House, Ranchi for and on behalf of Shri J. M. Sinha, Asst. Superintendent, NCDC Ltd., Ranchi & Others.—*Complainants.*

*Vs.*

The employers in relation to the National Coal Development Corporation Ltd., with its registered office at Darbhanga House, Ranchi through the Chairman/Managing Director.—*Opp. Parties.*

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the complainants.—Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate.

On behalf of the Opp. Parties.—(1) Shri L. Singh, Labour Officer.

(2) Shri R. S. Murti, Additional Chief Personnel Officer.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

Dhanbad, 26th September, 1970

AWARD

The complainants are represented by Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate and the opposite parties by Shri L. Singh, Labour Officer and Shri R. S. Murti, Additional Chief Personnel Officer. On behalf of the complainants an application is submitted for permission to withdraw the complaint petition. Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate has verified the contents as correct. The reason shown in the application for withdrawal is not taken into consideration. Permission is granted. Accordingly no dispute award is made and submitted under Sec. 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer.

[No. 1/22/67-LR-II(ii).]

S.O. 3535.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad in the matter of an application under Section 33A of the said Act, from Shri S. Bagal, Chief Draftsman, C.E. (Civil) Section, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Darbhanga House, Ranchi which was received by the Central Government on the 30th September, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)  
AT DHANBAD

PRESENT

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

COMPLAINT No. 40 of 1970

In the matter of a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Arising out of Reference No. 244 of 1967 referred to by the Ministry by its order No. 1/22/67-LRII dated 19th July, 1967).

**PARTIES:**

Shri S. Bagal, Chief Draftsman, C.E. (Civil) Section, N.C.D.C. Ltd., Darbhanga House, Ranchi—*Complainant*.

**Vs.**

The employer, in relation to the National Coal Development Corporation Limited, with its registered office at Darbhanga House, Ranchi through the Chairman/Managing Director—*Opp. Party*.

**APPEARANCES:**

*On behalf of the complainant.*—Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate.

*On behalf of the Opp. Party.*—(1) Shri L. Singh, Labour Officer.

(2) Shri R. S. Murti, Additional Chief Personnel Officer.

**STATE:** Bihar.

**INDUSTRY:** Coal.

*Dhanbad, 26th September, 1970*

**AWARD**

The complainant is represented by Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate and the opposite parties by Shri L. Singh, Labour Officer and Shri R. S. Murti, Additional Chief Personnel Officer. On behalf of the complainant an application is submitted for permission to withdraw the complaint petition. Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate has verified the contents as correct. The reason shown in the application for withdrawal is not taken into consideration. Permission is granted. Accordingly no dispute award is made and submitted under Sec. 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,

Presiding Officer,

Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad.

[No. 1/22/67-LR. II(III).]

**S.O. 3536.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under Section 33A of the said Act, from Shri N. Dutta, Upper Division Clerk, C.M.O. Section, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Darbhanga House, Ranchi which was received by the Central Government on the 30th September, 1970.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)  
AT DHANBAD**

**PRESENT**

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

**COMPLAINT NO. 2 OF 1970**

In the matter of a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Arising out of Reference No. 244 of 1967 referred to by the Ministry by its order No. 1/22/67-LR II dated 19th July, 1967).

**PARTIES:**

N. Dutta, Upper Division Clerk, C.M.O. Section, N.C.D.C. Ltd., Darbhanga House, Ranchi—*Complainant*.

**Vs.**

1. The employer in relation to the National Coal Development Corporation Ltd., having its registered office at Darbhanga House, Ranchi, through the Chairman/Managing Director.

2. Sri R. Sinha, Director (Administration), N.C.D.C. Ltd. Darbhanga House, Ranchi—*Opp. Parties*.

APPEARANCES

On behalf of the complainant—Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate

On behalf of the Opp Parties.—(1) Shri L Singh, Labour Officer

(2) Shri R S Murthi, Additional Chief Personnel Officer

STATE: Bihar

INDUSTRY. Coal.

Dhanbad, 26th September, 1970

4th Ashvina, 1892 (Saka).

AWARD

The complainant is represented by Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate and the opposite parties by Shri L. Singh, Labour Officer and Shri R S Murthi, Additional Chief Personnel Officer. On behalf of the complainant an application is submitted for permission to withdraw the complaint petition. Shri Karuna Nidhana Keshava, Advocate has verified the content as correct. The reason shown in the application for withdrawal is not taken into consideration. Permission is granted. Accordingly no dispute award is made and submitted under Sec 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) N. VENKATA RAO,

Presiding Officer

Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No 2), Dhanbad

[No 1/22/67-LR. II(iv)]

*New Delhi, the 22nd October 1970*

S.O. 3537.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Hyderabad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Singareni Collieries Company Limited Post Office Belampalli (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th October, 1970

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

PRESENT

Sri T Chandrasekhara Reddy, B A , B L , Chairman, Industrial Tribunal, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 7 OF 1970

BETWEEN:

Workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli—*Petitioner*

AND

Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli—*Respondent*.

APPEARANCES

None present for Petitioner. Sri Shyam Mohan, Personnel Officer, Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd, Belampalli for Respondent.

AWARD

By an Order No 7/27/69-LR II dated 17th January, 1970, the Government of India through its Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation (Department of Labour & Employment), referred the following industrial dispute between the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Belampalli and their workmen in respect of the subject matter mentioned in the schedule which runs as follows —

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Belampalli, is justified in denying the gratuity to Shri Chintala Elliah, Mason, Shantikhan of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Belampalli? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

The dispute was referred to the then Industrial Tribunal, presided over by Shri Mohammad Najmuddin. Subsequently, on his retirement, the above dispute was referred to me by order No. 8/106/70-LR.II, dated 5th September, 1970.

2. Shri Ganga Ram, Vice President of the Workers' Union, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampally, has sent a communication dated 23th June, 1970, which was received by this office on 30th June, 1970, mentioning therein that the Management had agreed to pay "the service gratuity" to Shri Chintala Elliah in view of his long service in the Company and that therefore he was withdrawing the case. He also stated therein that the claim is not pressed.

3. The matter was pending for want of necessary authorisation to me to adjudicate in this dispute. After the powers to adjudicate in this dispute were received, the matter was posted for today and the parties were served. Shri Ganga Ram was absent but the Personnel Officer Sri Shyam Mohan of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampally was present. The contents of the above communication are stated by the above said, Sri Shyam Mohan to be correct and he made an endorsement on the communication received by this office that the signature in the communication dated 28th June, 1970—received on 30th June, 1970 purporting to be that of Shri Ganga Ram, Vice President of the Workers' Union is that of Shri Ganga Ram. Thus I am satisfied that the signature in the above communication is that of Sri Ganga Ram and that the matter also is finally settled. So a nil Award is passed in the above Industrial Dispute and the reference is closed. A copy of the letter of the Vice President is enclosed herewith.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of the Tribunal, this the 3rd day of October, 1970.

(Sd.) T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY,  
Industrial Tribunal.

**BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL), HYDERABAD**

In the matter of I.D. 7/70

The Management of Singareni  
Collieries Co., Ltd., Bellampally.

*Versus*

Their Workmen.

We most respectfully submit:—

That the management of S. C. Co. Ltd., has agreed to pay the service gratuity to Sri Chintala Ellalah in view of his long service with the company vide General Manager's letter No. P36/2630/92 dated: 13th January, 1970, hence his application for the settlement of his gratuity was sent to the pay Master Kothaguda. In view of this I am withdrawing the case and we have got no claim.

Bellampally Collieries  
dated 28th June, 1970.

(Sd.) B. GANGA RAM,

Vice President.

I, B. Ganga Ram, Vice President of Singareni Collieries Worker's Union Bellampally solemnly state that what is stated above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Bellampally Collieries  
Bellampally Collieries

(Sd.) B. GANGA RAM,

Vice President.

S.C. Workers Union.

Signature of the Vice President is identified by me

(Sd.) SHYAM MOHAN 3-10-70.

Personnel Officer, S.C. Co. Ltd., Bellampally.

[No. 7/27/69-LR.II.]

*New Delhi, the 26th October 1970*

**S.O. 3538.**—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of Messrs Aluminium Corporation of India Limited, Post Office Jaykaynagar, District Burdwan and their workmen represented by the Jaykaynagar Colliery Mazdoor Union (Independent), Post Office Jaykaynagar, District Burdwan.

And whereas the said employers and workmen have by a written agreement in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration of the person specified therein, and a copy of the said agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 6th October, 1970.

FORM 'C'

(See Rule 7)

*Agreement*

(Under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

BETWEEN

**NAME OF THE PARTIES:**

*Representing employers:*

1. Shri H. S. Navalakha, Agent, Jaykaynagar Colliery, M/s. Aluminium Corpn. of India Ltd., P.O. Jaykaynagar, Dist. Burdwan.
2. Shri P. N. Agarwal, Manager, Jaykaynagar Colliery, P.O. Jaykaynagar, Dist. Burdwan.

*Representing workmen:*

1. Shri Bama Pada Mukherjee, Vice-President, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (CITU), P.O. Raniganj, Dist. Burdwan.
2. Shri Samir Dhar, Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (CITU), P.O. Raniganj, Dist. Burdwan.

It is agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial dispute to the arbitration of Shri P. C. Mullick, Judge, High Court, Calcutta, (Retired), 24, Mohini Mohan Road, Calcutta-20.

(i) *Specific matters in dispute:—*

"1. Whether the action of the management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of M/s. Aluminium Corporation of India Ltd., P.O. Jaykaynagar, Dist. Burdwan in closing down the Jaykaynagar Colliery with effect from 18th July, 1969 under its notice bearing No. Nil dated 17th July 1969 amounted to lockout as contended by the workmen or closure as contended by the management.

2. Whether the workmen concerned are entitled to any payment for the period from 18th July 1969 to 23rd October 1969 and if so what?"

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved.</p> <p>(iii) Name of the union, if any, representing the workmen in question.</p> | <p>Employers in relation to Jaykaynagar Colliery of M/s. Aluminium Corporation of India Limited, P.O. Jaykaynagar, Dist. Burdwan and their workmen.</p> <p>Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (CITU) P.O. Raniganj, Dist. Burdwan.</p> |
|--|--|

(iv) Total No. of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.

**641**

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.

**797**



We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of four months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

*Signature of the parties*

(Sd.) H. S. NAVALAKHA

(Sd.) BAMAPADA MUKHERJEE

(Sd.) P. N. AGARWAL

(Sd.) SAMIR DHAR

*Representing employers.*

*Representing workmen.*

*Witnesses:*

1. Illegible.

2. Illegible.

*Dated the 30th September 1970.*

[No. 8/184/70-LRII.]

**श्रम रोजगार व पुनर्वास मंत्रालय**

**(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)**

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्तूबर, 1970

का० आ० 3538—यतः मैसर्स एल्यूमिनियम कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया लिमिटेड, डाकघर जेकेनगर, जिला बर्दवान की जेकेनगर कालियरी के प्रबंधतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व जेकेनगर कालियरी मजदूर यूनियन (स्वतंत्र), डाकघर जेकेनगर जिला बर्दवान करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मचारियों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (I) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उसमें वर्णित व्यक्ति के माध्यम्य निर्णय के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है ;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा 3 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यम्य निर्णय करार को, जो उसे 6 अक्तूबर, 1970 को मिला था, एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

**करार**

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

**पक्षों के नाम**

**बीच**

**नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले**

**कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले**

1 श्री एच० एस० नावालाखा, एजेंट, जेकेनगर कालियरी, मैसर्स एल्यूमिनियम कारपोरेशन आफ इन्डिया लि० डाकघर जेकेनगर, जिला बर्दवान।

1 श्री बामा पदा मुखर्जी, उपाध्यक्ष, कालियरी मजदूर सभा (सी० आई० टी० यू०), डाकघर रानीगंज, जिला बर्दवान।

2 श्री पी० एन० अग्रवाल, प्रबंधक, जेकेनगर, कालियरी, डाकघर, जेकेनगर, जिला बर्दवान।

2 श्री समिर धर, मंत्री, कालियरी मजदूर सभा (सी० आई० टी० यू०), डाकघर रानीगंज, जिला बर्दवान।

पत्रों के बीच निम्नलिखित श्रौद्धोगिक विवाद की श्री पी० सी० मालिक, उच्च न्यायालय, कलकत्ता के सेवानिवृत्ति न्यायाधीश, 24 मोहिनी मोहन रोड, कलकत्ता-20 के माध्यम से निर्णय के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार किया गया है :—

- (i) विनिश्चित विवादग्रस्त विवाद-1. क्या मैसर्स एल्यूमिनियम कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया लिमिटेड, डाकघर जेकेनगर, जिला बर्दवान की जेकेनगर कालियरी में प्रबंधन की अपने बिना संख्या के दिनांक 17-7-1969 के नोटिस के अनुसार 18-7-1969 से जेकेनगर कालियरी को बंद करने की कार्यवाही तात्कालिक (जैसा कि कर्मचारों का तर्क है) अथवा कामबंदी (जैसा कि प्रबंधन का तर्क है) के समान थी?

2. क्या संशोधित कर्मचार 18-7-1969 से 23-10-69 की कालाविधि के लिए किसी अदायगी के हकदार हैं और यदि हां, तो किसके ?

- (ii) विवाद के पक्षों के विवरण, जिनमें अन्तर्ग्रस्त मैसर्स एल्यूमिनियम कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया स्थापन या उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी लिमिटेड, डाकघर जेकेनगर, जिला बर्दवान में जेकेनगर कालियरी से संबंध नियोजक सम्मिलित है। और उनके कर्मचार ।

- (iii) यदि कोई संघ संबंधित कर्मचारों का कोलियरी मजदूर सभा (सी० आई० टी० यू) प्रतिनिधित्व करता हो तो उसका नाम : डाकघर रानीगंज जिला बर्दवान ।

- (iv) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मचारों 641 की कुल संख्या

- (v) विवाद से प्रभावित या सम्भाव्य प्रभावित 592 होने वाले कर्मचारों की प्राथकलित संख्या

हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थ का विनिश्चय हम पर बन्धनकारी होगा ।

मध्यस्थ अपना पंचाट चार मास की कालाविधि या इतने और समय के भीतर जो हमारे बीच परस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, देगा । यदि पूर्व वर्णित कालाविधि के भीतर पंचाट नहीं दिया जाता तो मध्यस्थ निर्णय के लिए निर्देश स्वतः रद्द हो जायगा और हम नए मध्यस्थ निर्णय के लिए बातचीत करने को स्वतंत्र होंगे ।

### पक्षों के हस्ताक्षर

ह०/-एच० एस०, नावालाखा 3-9-70

ह०/- बामापदा मुखर्जी

ह०/-पी० एन० अग्रवाल, 30-9-70

ह०/- समिर घर, 30-9-70

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले सभी

कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

1-य०।-

दिनांक 30 सितम्बर, 1970

(सं० 8-184-70 एल० आर० 2)

## ORDERS

New Delhi, the 15th October 1970

S.O. 3539.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Assam Oil Company Limited, Digboi and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri G. N. Bora, as Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Digboi and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal.

### SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Messrs Assam Oil Company Limited Digboi is justified in discharging Sri Habib Ali, Registered No. 30879, with effect from the 2nd December, 1961 from employment? If not, to what relief Sri Ali is entitled?

[No. 7(3)/70-LR-IV.]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर, 1970

कं०आ० 3539.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में असम आयल कम्पनी लिमिटेड डिगबोई के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी० एन० बोरा होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय डिगबोई होगा और उक्त विवाद को उस औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

### अनुसूची

"क्या मेसर्स असम आयल कम्पनी लिमिटेड डिगबोई के प्रबन्धतंत्र का श्री हबीब अली, रजिस्टर्ड सं० 30879 को 2 दिसम्बर, 1961 से नियोजन से सेवान्मुक्त करना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो श्री अली किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?"

[सं० 7(3)/70-एस आर IV]

New Delhi, the 16th October 1970

S.O. 3540.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Digwadih Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron Steel Company Limited, Jamadoba, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central

Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted under Section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Digwadih Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Jamadoba, Post Office Jeogora, District Dhanbad, in terminating the lien on permanent appointment of Shri Bideshi Ram Kakar, Sand Bucket Mazdoor, with effect from the 7th February, 1969 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

[No. 2/94/70-LRII.]

नई दिल्ली, 16 अक्टूबर, 1970

क०प्र० 3540.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मेसर्स टाटा आयरन एंड स्टील कंपनी लिमिटेड जामदोबा, डाकघर जीयलगोड़ा, जिला धनबाद की डिगवाडिह कोयलाखान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) के धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं० 2) धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

"क्या मेसर्स टाटा आयरन एंड स्टील कंपनी लिमिटेड जामदोबा, डाकघर जीयलगोड़ा, जिला धनबाद की डिगवाडिह कोयलाखान के प्रबन्धतंत्र की श्री विदेशी राम कक्कड़, रेत बाल्टी मजदूर के स्थायी नियुक्ति पर धारणधिकार को 6 फरवरी, 1969 से समाप्त करने को कार्यवाही न्यायाचिनी थी? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

[सं० 2/94/70-एल प्रार II]

S.O. 3541.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bhowra Colliery belonging to Karamchand Thapar and Brothers (Private) Limited, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted under Section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bhowra Colliery belonging to Karamchand Thapar and Brothers (Private) Limited, in stopping from work Shri Mohammad Sakur, Pump Khalasi with effect from the 21st February, 1970, was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

[No. 2/105/70-LRII.]  
P. C. MISRA, Under Secy.

का० आ० 3541.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में करमचन्द थापर एण्ड ब्रदर्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड आकधर, भौरा, धनबाद की भौरा कोयलाखाना से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं० 2) धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

### अनुसूची

“क्या करमचन्द थापर एण्ड ब्रदर्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड की भौरा कोयलाखाना के प्रबन्धनतंत्र की श्री मोहम्मद सकूर, पप्प खलासी को 21 फरवरी, 1970 से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी? यदि नहीं तो वह किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[सं० 2/105/70-एल० आर० II]

पि० सि० मिश्रा, अधर सचिव ।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 24th October 1970

S.O. 3542.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st November, 1970 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI [except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following area in the State of Tamil Nadu, namely:—

“The area within the limits of the revenue villages of Abatharanapuram, Serakuppam and Parvathipuram in Cuddalore taluk, in South Arcot District.”

[No. 604(19)70-HI.]

(अम और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 अक्टूबर, 1970

का० आ० 3542.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा प्रथम नवम्बर, 1970 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 (धारा 44 और 45 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं) और अध्याय 5 और 6 (धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79, और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं) के उपाबंध तमिलनाडु राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे अर्थात्:—

“साउथ अर्काट जिले में, कुड्डलोर तालुक में अबथारनपुरम, सेरकुप्पम और पार्वथीपुरम के राजस्व ग्रामों की सीमाओं के भीतर आने वाला क्षेत्र” ।

[सं० फा० 604 (19)/70-एच आई]

**S.O. 3543.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st day of November, 1970 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI [except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Tamil Nadu, namely:—

"The area within the municipal limits of Nellikuppam in Cuddalore taluk in South Arcot District."

[No. 604(20)70-HI.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

का० आ० 3543.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्राय सरकार एतद्वारा नवम्बर, 1970 के प्रथम दिन को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करता है जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 (धारा 44 और 45 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) और अध्याय 5 और 6 [धारा 76 का उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं] के उद्देश्य तमिल नाडु राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात्:—

"साउथ अरुटि जिले में, कूडलोर तालुक में नेल्लिकुप्पम की नगर पालिका सीमाओं के भीतर आने वाले क्षेत्र।"

[सं० का० 604 (20)/70-एच आई]

दलजीत सिंह, प्रवर सचिव।

#### (Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 19th October 1970

**S.O. 3544.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relations to M/s. Best and Company Limited, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th September, 1970.

#### BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, MADRAS

Wednesday, the 9th day of September, 1970

#### PRESENT:

Thiru S. Syamikkannu, B.Sc., M.L., Industrial Tribunal, Madras.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 42 OF 1970

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication U/s 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act 1947 between the workmen and the management of M/s. Best and Company Ltd., Madras.]

#### BETWEEN:

1. The General Secretary, Madras Port and Dock Workers Congress, No. 11, Philips St., Madras-1.
2. The Secretary, Best Employees Union, 13-B, Second Line Beach, Madras-1.

#### AND

The General Manager, Labour and Personnel, M/s. Best and Co., 13/15, North Beach Road, P.B. No. 63, Madras-1.

#### REFERENCE:

Order No. 29/64/69/Fac. II dated 30th October, 1969 of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal upon perusing the reference and all other material papers on record and Thiru M. Eaphon Ponniah, the General Secretary of the Best employees' Union having filed an application for dismissing the claim as not pressed and allowing the same and Thiru D. R. Rama Rao, the General Manager for the Management having filed a statement along with petitions of the claimants for dismissing the claims as withdrawn and recording the same, this Tribunal made the following award;

This is an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the M/s. Best and Company Limited, Madras and their workmen in respect of matters specified in the schedule annexed to the reference, referred for adjudication to this Tribunal by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), by its order dated 30th October 1969.

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the Management of M/s. Best and Co. Ltd., Madras have correctly applied the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in retrenching the following workers with effect from 18th July, 1969.

Sl. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri E. D. Rozario	Supervisor.
2.	Shri E. V. Rao	Supervisor.
3.	Shri Joseph Johnson	Supervisor.
4.	Shri S. Balasundaram	Supervisor.
5.	Shri K. Baboo	Supervisor.
6.	Shri E. G. Johnson	Supervisor.
7.	Shri G. B. Chinnikrishnap	Receipt Clerk.
8.	Shri C. M. Natarajan	Receipt Clerk.
9.	Shri M. Yacub Khan	Receipt Clerk.
10.	Shri M. Raman	Receipt Clerk.
11.	Shri N. Padmanabhan	Receipt Clerk.

If not, to what relief are the workers entitled?"

2. Management files a statement today along with petitions of the claimants to dismiss the Industrial Dispute as withdrawn. The statements are recorded. Award is passed accordingly.

S. SWAMIKKANNU.  
Industrial Tribunal.

List of Witnesses Examined for both sides:  
None

List of Documents Marked for both sides:  
Nil.

[No. 29/64/69-Fac.II.]  
AJIT CHANDRA, Under Secy.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMPANY AFFAIRS

#### CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 24th October 1970

S.O. 3545.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Department of Company Affairs No. S.O. 2607, dated the 1st August, 1970 and published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) Extraordinary, at page 1187,—

in line 9, for "Shri A. N. Alagiriswamy" read "Shri A. Alagiriswami"; ;  
in line 12, for "Shri H. K. Paranjpe", read "Shri H. K. Paranjape".

[No. F. 7/3/70-M(P).]  
H. D. Panjwani, Under Secy.

## कम्पनी-कार्य विभाग

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 24 अक्टूबर, 1970

एन० ओ० 3545—भारत सरकार के कम्पनी कार्य विभाग की (अंग्रेजी में) अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2607 तारीख 1 अगस्त, 1970 में जो भारत के राजपत्र, असाधारण भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उनखण्ड (ii) में पृष्ठ 1187 पर प्रकाशित हुई है:—

पंक्ति 9 में “Shri A. N. Alagiriswamy” के

स्थान पर “Shri A. Alagiriswami” पढ़िए:

पंक्ति 12 में “Shri H. K. Paranjpe” के

स्थान पर “Shri H. K. Paranjape” पढ़िए ।

[सं० फा० 7/3/70-एम (पी)]

एच० डी० पंजवानी, सचिव ।